

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/708,265	02/20/2004	Yoji Maeda	JP920020215US1	2264
24241	7590 06/15/2006		EXAMINER	
IBM MICROELECTRONICS INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY LAW			ELVE, MARIA ALEXANDRA	
1000 RIVER STREET			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
972 E			1725	
ESSEX JUNCTION, VT 05452			DATE MAILED: 06/15/2006	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

			v
	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/708,265	MAEDA ET AL.	
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	M. Alexandra Elve	1725	
The MAILING DATE of this communication a Period for Reply	ppears on the cover sheet wi	th the correspondence address	-
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REP WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory perions for reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by state Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mail earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DATE OF THIS COMMUNIO 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a report of will apply and will expire SIX (6) MON ute. cause the application to become AE	CATION. eply be timely filed THS from the mailing date of this communi ANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status			
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05	April 2006.		
2a) This action is FINAL . 2b) ⊠ Th	nis action is non-final.		
3) Since this application is in condition for allow	•	•	ts is
closed in accordance with the practice under	<i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D	. 11, 453 O.G. 213.	
Disposition of Claims			
4) ☑ Claim(s) 1-10 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdreds 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☑ Claim(s) 1-10 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and	rawn from consideration.		
Application Papers			
9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examin 10) ☑ The drawing(s) filed on 20 February 2004 is/a Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the I	are: a)⊠ accepted or b)□ on the drawing(s) be held in abeyand the drawing on the drawing on the drawing of the	ce. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). (s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.1	• •
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority document of the priority document of the priority document of the priority document of the copies of the priority document of the priority document of the certified copies of the cer	nts have been received. nts have been received in A fority documents have been au (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	pplication No received in this National Stage	e
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) ☐ Interview S	ummary (PTO-413)	
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/0 Paper No(s)/Mail Date	Paper No(s)/Mail Date Iformal Patent Application (PTO-152)	

Application/Control Number: 10/708,265

Art Unit: 1725

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over De Steur et al. (USPN 6,649,864) in view of Leighton (USPN 4,822,974).

De Steur et al. discloses laser drilling of holes in a circuit board substrate. A perforated mask is used to drill a hole with a predetermined diameter. During drilling the laser beam is moved in a circular path (wobble motion). (abstract, figures, col. 1-3)

De Steur et al. does not teach the angle of the wobble motion.

Leighton discloses the drilling of holes using a laser. The beam angle is controlled with a prism in order to form various hole shapes. (abstract, figures, col. 1-3)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to determine the angle of the beam relative to the axis, as taught by Leighton in the De Steur et al. process because this is merely a measurement of the operational parameters and ensures the formation of a quality drilled product.

Claims 9-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hiramatsu (USPAP 2004/0222197 A1).

Hiramatsu discloses a laser system for forming via holes in a substrate. A CO2 laser oscillator generates a laser beam, which is, passes through a condenser lens (92), a collimator lens (90) and a transfer mask (62). The beam is then positioned by galvano-mirrors (74X & 74Y), which are connected to angle adjustment motors (72X & 72Y) and finally passed through an f-theta lens (76) before impinging on the substrate. The substrate is mounted on a X-Y table (80), which may be moved relative to the laser head. Additionally, the system has a target mask (211), which may be placed on the substrate. The mask may be used to alter the diameter of the laser beam. (abstract, figures, 0027, 0043, 0056, 0060, 0062, 0066, 0068, 0095, 0111, 0112, 0133-0139, 0142, 0144-0145, 0153-0163, 0178-0181, 0187, 0197, 0207-0210, 0220, 0223, 0227-0228)

The f-theta lens is not a true condenser lens, although it is known for linearity effects. Substitution of known equivalent structures, in this case, an f-theta lens for a condensing lens is well known in the art. In re Ruff 118 USPQ 343 (CCPA 1959). In addition, the use of a condenser lens (92) is taught and is present in the apparatus set up. The reversal of parts was held to have been obvious. In re Gazda 104 USPQ 400. The rearrangement of parts was held to have been obvious. In re Japikse 86 USPQ 70.

Application/Control Number: 10/708,265

Art Unit: 1725

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims have been considered but are moot

in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to M. Alexandra Elve whose telephone number is 571-272-

1173. The examiner can normally be reached on 6:30-3:00 Monday to Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Patrick J. Ryan can be reached on 571-272-1292. The fax phone number

for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

June 10, 2006.

M. Alexandra Elve

Primary Examiner 1725

Page 4